

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100070004-1

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100070004-1

Let Everybody See How Degraded Modern Revisionists Have Become

People's Daily, Peking 17 September

On 7 August, Tito gave a long interview to American correspondent Drew Pearson. U.S. monopoly capital attached much importance to this interview and published it in 250 U.S. newspapers. Today this paper publishes this noteworthy lesson by negative example so that readers can see how degraded the modern revisionists have become.

Four years ago the Titoites formulated the "Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists" to oppose the international Communist movement. Now, this renegade Tito has taken another big step "forward." In his interview with Pearson, he openly advertised the need to effect the "economic integration" and "political integration" of the world, and asked his master, U.S. imperialism, to use "economic and democratic methods" to cope with "certain infiltration or aggression in a broad sense by communism."

The interview more glaringly shows up the features of the modern revisionists of Yugoslavia as renegades. By its words and deeds the Tito group proves to the world how degraded modern revisionists have become and how much more degraded they will become in the future. No matter what flowery words they use or how they camouflage themselves, once they have embarked on the road of betrayal of the revolution and become pawns of imperialism, they inevitably continue down the road which leads to ever greater and deeper disgrace. The counter-revolutionary careers of Bernstein, Kautsky, Plekhanov, Trotsky, Chen Tu-shiu, and their like, old renegades of the international workers movement, ended this way. The counterrevolutionary career of such modern revisionists as Tito will also end this way.

The Tito group propagated its modern revisionist views centering on the questions of war and peace. In the interview, Tito not only did not expose the real enemy of peace before the people but, on the contrary, defended U.S. imperialism. Tito held that the danger of war exists at present merely because "everybody" is "armed to the teeth," and because military circles have influenced the U.S. and Soviet governments. Here, the Tito group has completely negated the essential difference between the imperialist United States and the Socialist Soviet Union. It is against the exposure of the true features of U.S. imperialism, and opposed to the mobilization of the masses to wage a resolute struggle against the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war as well as against old colonialism and neocolonialism.

These extremely preposterous ideas which Tito propagates are completely contrary to the fundamental interests of the world's people striving for lasting peace. Tito tries to make people believe that only "wise men" are needed to bring about world peace. According to him, "wise men" would not entertain the thought of war. In Tito's eyes, U.S. imperialist leaders, such as Kennedy, are these "wise men."

Please note, it is precisely with these unscientific absurdities that renegades attempt in vain to negate completely the Marxist-Leninist scientific analysis of imperialism, to deny that imperialism is the source of war in modern times and that U.S. imperialism is the enemy of world peace. They try by such means to lull the vigilance of the people the world over, to shield acts of aggression of U.S. imperialism, and to give it an even freer hand to prepare for the unleashing of a new world war.

In the "Program of the Yugoslav League of Communists" the Tito group advocated so-called nonaligned "positive coexistence" which makes no distinction between the enemy and ourselves. With this signboard, the Tito group becomes very active in all parts of the world -- especially in Asian and African regions -- in whitewashing and serving U.S. imperialism, in undermining the national liberation movement and the nationalist countries' policies of genuine independence and neutrality, and in disrupting the friendly relations between the nationalist countries and the socialist countries.

(CONTINUED)

Now, in his interview, Tito was even more anxious to have the world believe that imperialist countries will cease to plunder other countries, the imperialist powers will cease to grab colonies, that imperialist states will cease to quarrel among themselves over colonial interests, and that the imperialist will cease to resort to war to oppose the socialist system.

According to Tito, colonies and colonialism have ceased to exist in the world. According to this logic of the Tito group, the nature of imperialism has changed. There is no differentiation between aggressor states and states which are victims of aggression, between oppressor nations and oppressed nations, between imperialist countries which commit aggression and war and countries striving for and safeguarding independence and freedom, and between imperialist countries and socialist countries.

It therefore follows that first "economic integration" and then "political integration" can be realized among all these states without distinction between them. These are lies of the reactionary bourgeoisie and a reproduction of the "cosmopolitanism" of the U.S. imperialists.

Please note, it is by these moves and preposterous arguments that the renegades attempt in vain to shatter the struggle of the people of the world over against the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war, and to shatter the struggle for liberation of all oppressed nations and peoples, as well as the revolutionary will of the people of the socialist countries; and to help U.S. imperialism to achieve its plan for world hegemony.

In the eyes of the Tito group, it seems that the existing principal contradictions in the world--the contradictions between socialism and imperialism, the contradictions between imperialism and the colonies and semi-colonies, the contradictions among the imperialist monopolist groups and among the imperialist powers, and the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--either no longer exist or are reconcilable; and consequently the world can achieve "political integration" following "economic integration."

Such was Tito's point of departure when in his interview he talked about "better mutual cooperation among the peoples." According to the logic of the Tito group, class struggle in all forms and all spheres will henceforth come to an end and no revolutions are necessary. Let everybody see how the renegades use the fallacy of "mutual cooperation" to suit the neocolonialist policy of U.S. imperialism, to suit the U.S. imperialist policy of "peaceful evolution" toward the socialist countries, a policy of infiltration and subversion from within, and to suit the "world community" policy much vaunted by the Kennedy administration of late.

Obviously these reactionary policies are aimed at making the peoples of the world accept resignedly U.S. imperialist aggression, at changing the independent nationalist countries into new colonies, at having the socialist countries "peacefully evolve" in to the revival of capitalism and at "integrating" the peoples of the world into an army of slaves of imperialism.

It must also be pointed out that the Tito group is fond of talking about "peaceful growth." The capitalist countries, they used to say, can "peacefully grow" into socialism. But the pitiable modern revisionists have so far failed to produce a single concrete example to prove their point. On the contrary, there is a concrete example of a socialist country "peacefully evolving" into a capitalist country, and that country is Yugoslavia.

In the interview Tito went so far as brazenly to impute the crimes of "infiltration" and "aggression" to the socialist countries and the international communist movement. He was so shameless that he advised U.S. imperialism to use more covert, more vicious, and more cunning "economic and democratic methods" to stamp out the national liberation movement, to wipe out the revolutionary movements of the peoples, to undermine the socialist camp and to destroy the socialist countries. This shows that the Tito group has openly become the advance guard of the U.S. imperialists in carrying out their counterrevolutionary policies and completely exposes the Titoites as a group of out-and-out renegades to communism and lackeys of U.S. imperialism.

In the interview Tito launched vile attacks on China's home and foreign policies. That the Marxists-Leninists were attacked by the renegades is not strange at all. It would indeed be strange if they were not attacked.

Tito claimed that "China took various actions fairly independently in international politics and at home" and that the Soviet Union was having a "pacifying" effect. What nonsense! Is not this the same as the imperialist talk and aimed at estranging the relations between China and the Soviet Union; China is an independent and sovereign socialist country, naturally, it has its own independent home and foreign policies.

The relations between the socialist countries are relations of brothers based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, which form a new type of international relations characterized by solidarity and friendship, supporting and helping each other, and also treating each other as equals and respecting each other's independence and sovereignty. These new-type international relations are completely different from those between Yugoslavia and the United States. Everybody knows that under the rule of the Tito group, Yugoslavia has always followed the baton of its master, U.S. imperialism, both in internal and external affairs.

Obviously, Tito's allegation here that China "took various actions fairly independently," like the one made some time ago by Kardelj that China "has an utterly unique line" in its internal development and international policy, is meant to vilify the Chinese Communist Party as taking a so-called unique line in the international communist movement. But such slanders made by Tito and his ilk are futile. In its socialist revolution and socialist construction, the Chinese Communist Party has steadfastly adhered to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and has combined them with the practices in the specific conditions of China.

In the international communist movement, in struggling against imperialism and for world peace, and in supporting the just cause of the national liberation movement, the Chinese Communists, together with all other Marxists-Leninists of the world, have always held high the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism and have steadfastly persisted in and firmly upheld the common program of the communist and workers parties of various nations-- the Moscow declaration of 1957 and the Moscow statement of 1960.

In the eyes of the modern revisionists like Tito, the line followed by the Chinese Communist Party is "unique" merely because the Chinese Communist Party is following a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line, a proletarian internationalist line, and not any other line; because the Chinese Communist Party stands firm against modern revisionism, which remains the main danger to the international communist movement, while opposing dogmatism and sectarianism as well. But to all Marxists-Leninists and the revolutionary people, to the people of various nations who make up over 90 percent of the world's population, including workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and the revolutionary national bourgeoisie, and to all oppressed nations and peoples, no such question as "uniqueness" has ever arisen concerning the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line followed by the Chinese Communist Party.

The communists and all other people of China share the destiny and life-breath of all other Marxists-Leninists and of all other peoples of the world, uniting as one and fighting shoulder to shoulder with them against the imperialists, the reactionaries, and the modern revisionists. These indisputable facts can never be effaced by the nonsensical falsifications of Tito and his ilk.

It was by no means accidental that this interview appeared at a time when the struggle between the socialist camp and the people of all the world on the one hand and U.S. imperialists on the other has become more acute and more complicated, when the socialist camp has grown more powerful and the national, democratic revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been continually surging ahead, and when the struggle of the people throughout the world against the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war and for defending world peace is developing ever more vigorously.

The Kennedy government has run into tremendous difficulties both at home and abroad. To overcome these difficulties, it is pushing ahead on all fronts with its "grand strategy" of the "world community." At the same time, the Titoites are leaving no stone unturned to call for the realization of the "economic integration" and "political integration" of the world. This is certainly no "coincidence." On the contrary, it is to meet the very counter-revolutionary requirements of U.S. imperialism and is an indication of the sharp international class struggles at the present time and of the collusion between imperialism and its lackeys.

It is very helpful for all Marxists-Leninists and the revolutionary people to read Tito's interview with Pearson which will help one to recognize more clearly the true colors of the modern revisionists. The Titoites are in no sense Marxists-Leninists, but renegades from Marxism-Leninism; they are absolutely not revolutionaries but are faithful lackeys of U.S. imperialism. The Yugoslav League of Communists which they control has long ceased to be a Marxist-Leninist party. The series of revisionist home and foreign policies adopted in Yugoslavia by the Tito group have reduced to nothing the revolutionary gains won by the Yugoslav people through their heroic struggle, and, consequently, Yugoslavia has ceased to be a socialist country.

The statement of the 1960 meeting of representatives of the communist and workers parties says: "After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the declaration of 1957; they set the Yugoslav League of Communists against the international communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called aid from the United States and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle. The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the socialist camp and the world communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries."

Tito's interview with U.S. correspondent Pearson is additional proof of the correctness of this Marxist-Leninist conclusion of the Moscow statement.

The Moscow statement also points out: "Further exposure of the leaders of the Yugoslav revisionists, and the active struggle to safeguard the communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists remain an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist parties." Tito's interview with American correspondent Pearson further testifies to the major historic significance of this solemn call of the Moscow statement.

Adhering steadfastly to the stand and viewpoints of the Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement, the Chinese Communist Party resolutely holds that an uncompromising struggle must be waged against modern revisionism. The resolution of the Moscow meeting of communist and workers parties, adopted in 1958 at the Second Session of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, says:

"It is the sacred duty of our party toward the international working class to work, together with the fraternal parties, for the complete defeat of modern revisionism politically and theoretically, and for the safeguarding of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology."

The resolution of the meeting of representatives of communist and workers parties, adopted in 1961 at the Ninth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, says: "In order to safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism and its creative application and development, it is necessary firmly to combat revisionism which mirrors bourgeois ideology and departs from and betrays Marxism-Leninism, and especially to combat Yugoslav revisionism." We persist in this Marxist-Leninist stand.

Uniting always with all Marxist-Leninist parties and with all revolutionary people of the world, we hold aloft forever the bright, all-conquering banner of Marxism-Leninism so as to carry on the struggle against modern revisionism to the end! Marxism-Leninism must not be contaminated; modern revisionism is doomed to utter failure; Marxism-Leninism will certainly triumph throughout the world!

THE TREND OF THE SPACE RACE

I

On 6 September, 1962, the Baltimore Sun published the following story (datelined 5 September) on Soviet space failures:

(Washington Bureau of The Sun)

Washington, Sept. 5-the United States Government disclosed tonight that the Soviet Union has made six attempts to send space probes to the planets and that only one was successful.

In response to a request by both congressional Space Committees, James E. Webb, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, disclosed formally for the first time what this country knows about Russia's various space probes.

In a letter to Senator Kerr (D., Okla.), chairman of the Senate Space Committee, and to Representative Miller (D., Cal.), chairman of the House Space Committee, Webb said:

"You jointly proposed that if the United States Government possesses any information relative to the unsuccessful planetary probes by the Soviet Union, that this information should be made available to your committees and the American people."

Inquiries Made

Webb said that he agreed and that in response to this proposal inquiries had been made to the appropriate agencies of the Government. Their response was:

"The Soviet Union has pursued a vigorous but unsuccessful program to send instrumented space probes to the planets. Thus far, two attempts have been made to send space craft to Mars and four to Venus. Of these six attempts, only one probe was successfully launched on an interplanetary path, the Venus probe of February 12, 1961.

"However, it was only a qualified success because its radio transmission failed after several days, long before it reached Venus. None of the five remaining attempts achieved successful trajectory because of rocket vehicle malfunctions."

Dispatches Noted

The chairmen of the two congressional committees had expressed to Webb extreme discomfort over the fact that dispatches had appeared in last Saturday morning's newspapers to the effect that the Soviet Union had failed in an attempt to send a space vehicle successfully to Venus on August 25, 1962.

They also said that the leading Soviet space expert, Dr. L. I. Sedov, had made questionable statements about the success of the Russian space shots. They said that the world must of necessity admire Soviet space achievements, but "a shadow is thrown over the entire space effort through their refusal to admit failures."

Webb, in response to the congressional inquiry, gave the following details of the six shots into space made by the Soviet:

1. October 10, 1960-An unannounced attempt to send a probe to Mars failed before a parking orbit was achieved. Had this probe been successful it would have reached Mars in about 230 days.

2. October 14, 1960-A second attempt to send a probe to Mars, using virtually the same trajectory, failed.

(CONTINUED)

Weight Record Claimed

3. February 4, 1961-In the first attempt to send a spacecraft to Venus, the craft was successfully placed in its earth parking orbit, but could not be ejected into its planned Venus trajectory. The Soviet announced the launching as a successful earth satellite. Sputnik VII, and claimed for it a new weight in orbit, a record of 14,300 pounds.

4. February 12, 1961-A partially successful attempt to send a 1,400 pound spacecraft to Venus was made. All vehicle stages functioned normally. The probe was correctly placed on its interplanetary path. The Soviet Union currently announced that this was the first time that a spacecraft was successfully ejected outward from orbit. The probe took 97 days to reach the vicinity of Venus. The Soviet apparently experienced a failure in the power supply or radio transmitter and the probe was last heard from at a distance 4,500,000 miles from earth.

5. August 25, 1962-A third attempt to send a probe to Venus was made. The payload was successfully placed into satellite parking orbit, but apparently could not be ejected. Had this shot been successful, the probe would have arrived at Venus about December 7, 1962, ahead of the United States Mariner II.

6. September 1, 1962-In the fourth attempt to reach Venus, a spacecraft was also successfully placed into a satellite parking orbit, but could not be ejected. The Soviet Union has not yet announced this attempt, nor the presence of the unused components in orbit.

Same Combination Used

The government's detailed explanation of the Soviet's space probes said 'the same mission-planning philosophy and vehicle combination was used on each of the Soviet interplanetary series.

"A parking orbit technique is consistently exploited, whereby the first three stage attempts to launch the payload into a low-earth satellite orbit as in the United States Mariner program.

"After one passage around the earth, the fourth, or ejection, stage is fired over Africa. If successful, this sends the instrumented probe on a ballistic path to the planets.

"Had the launching been successful in each of the six cases, the probe would have arrived at Venus or Mars with too high a velocity to have been orbited around either planet.

"Optimum Conditions were chosen for each launching attempted thus far so as to simplify the task of either guidance or performance-or both, the Government's statement said.

II

On 11 September, the US National Aeronautics and Space Administration released the following progress report to the public:

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration today announced that Mariner II will be 2,548,905 miles from the earth and travelling at a speed of 6,512 miles per hour at 12 noon (EDT) Tuesday, September 11, 1962.

The 447-pound spacecraft was launched from the Atlantic Missile Range at Cape Canaveral, Fla., on August 27.

On September 4, a planned midcourse correction was carried out successfully and the flight path of the spacecraft was altered to bring Mariner II within 9,000 miles of the planet Venus on December 14.

Mariner II carries six experiments. Four experiments are operating on the way to Venus and sending back to earth information on magnetic fields, energetic particles and cosmic dust particles. Two other experiments designed to obtain information on the planet's temperature and atmosphere are to operate for a period of 30 minutes as the spacecraft passes Venus.

Fred D. Kochendorfer, Mariner program chief in the NASA Office of Space Sciences, said that successful completion of the midcourse correction and continued operation of the spacecraft is an important technological achievement.

"The Mariner II flight already has demonstrated that the United States has moved forward in the development of a controllable spacecraft," he explained.

"Mariner II was nearly 1.5 million miles from earth when it was commanded to complete a complicated series of maneuvers which changed its course and speed," Kochendorfer added. "These maneuvers were carried out successfully, confirming the validity of NASA's approach in developing a versatile family of spacecraft which will be used in scientific investigations of the moon and planets."

III

The contrast between the Mariner II success and the Soviet Venus and Mars failures puts a new perspective on the space race. Looking back to the fifties, the Soviets built larger rockets to start with because they had not developed light-weight nuclear warheads; then, too, they recognized early the propaganda possibilities of objects in space. At any rate, while the US failed to place the first vehicle in orbit because it failed to appreciate the propaganda importance of being first, and not because of technical incapacity, the USSR was in a better position to launch a large vehicle carrying a man. The Soviet space effort had two aims: 1) to show that the USSR was now a technically advanced country, and 2) to convey to the rest of the world the idea that Soviet rockets could deliver H-bombs anywhere. While the Soviet Union had been open to US attack since 1945, the US and many other areas had hitherto been out of the Soviet reach. Concerned with their two messages, and perhaps a little complacent about their accomplishments, the Soviets did relatively little in the way of scientific space exploration, developing satellites for communication purposes and for weather prediction, or investigating the possibilities of space reconnaissance. By 5 March 1962, the US had launched 66 satellites in earth orbit, of which 33 were still in orbit and 10 were transmitting; the USSR had launched 13 vehicles into earth orbit, of which only one, not transmitting, was still in space. In other words, the US aim was to have satellites up and functioning for a wide range of scientific purposes; the Soviet aim was to leave the impression that they could bring vehicles down whenever (and wherever) they wanted -- with any load they pleased.

On 16 March, the Soviets launched the first of a series of seven transmitting satellites, whose announced purposes included the investigation of cosmic rays, cloud systems, magnetic fields, meteorite dust, solar emissions, weather conditions, and the like. (The paths followed by these satellites also suggested that space reconnaissance was involved.) Tass stated that the first satellite marked "the beginning of a vast new program of space research," and indeed the program seemed designed partially to remedy the lag in Soviet-scientific space research. The US, on the other hand, has begun the development of larger rocket boosters, not for any military purpose, but because more power will be required to send men to the moon than was possessed by existing US (or Soviet) rockets. The first-generation Saturn had its first launching test on 27 October 1961; when the second stage is added and the vehicle is operational (in 1963), it will be able to orbit a space craft twice the weight of that used in the Gargarin, Titov, Nikolayev, and Popovich space exploits. The early use of the Saturn vehicle will be to place a three-man Apollo space craft into an earth orbit for up to two weeks. After that, an advanced version will send a later model of the same spacecraft to a moon orbit and return. The booster for moon flight will have ~~five times~~ the thrust of the first-generation Saturn. Prior to last June, US plans called for either

1) a rendezvous in earth orbit of two advanced Saturns before going to the moon, or else 2) the use of an even bigger vehicle (Nova) for a direct shot to the moon. Soviet announcements that the twin Nikolayev and Popovich flights were designed to "obtain experimental data on the possibility of establishing direct contact between two ships" suggest that they may be planning to use the first of the foregoing procedures. The latest US thinking however, is to send a space craft directly to a moon orbit, and use a small space ferry or "bug" to take two crew members to the moon surface and then back to the space craft. This will obviate the necessity for an earth orbit (though not for a moon orbit) rendezvous, and will make it unnecessary to send such a large vehicle. NASA hopes by this short-cut to advance the date of the moon flight to 1967. Meanwhile, an intensified scientific program, including the Ranger moon probes, is gathering the necessary data.

As always, Soviet plans are a secret. The Soviets were fortunate in having required and built large boosters for military purposes; they also had the political cleverness to use them in space to further the image of their scientific and military strength. But from now on, it will be less easy for them to stay in the space race. The US space program has a much broader scientific base, and the US is almost certainly now devoting more resources to space than are the Soviets. President Kennedy said in Houston: "This year's space budget is three times what it was in January 1961, and it is greater than the space budget of the previous eight years combined. That budget now stands at \$5,400,000,000 a year...." It may be that the Soviets will not be prepared to foot the bill for the much larger rockets needed for moon flight, though they will probably be ready to go some distance further to establish space platforms for military purposes. (The US has stated it has no plans to place weapons of mass destruction in orbit.) Both nations could, of course, be spared much expense if the Soviets were willing freely to exchange information about their rocket systems and space craft. Aside from Telstar the US is cooperating with Canada and the UK in launching satellites with scientific experiments (the first US-UK satellite was launched on 26 April, and the first US-Canadian satellite will probably be launched in late September or October), and with Argentina, Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, and Sweden in smaller "sounding" rocket programs. But when Titov, while visiting the US, was invited to visit Cape Canaveral, the Soviets refused, since this might have involved them in a counter-invitation to an American astronaut to visit a Soviet launching site.

Aside from cost considerations, there is another more important reason why it is regrettable that the USSR does not share information on its space activities. Scientists, and those who understand science, know from experience that science is in large measure a matter of communication between and among scientists, not only for a mere exchange of information, but more importantly, to subject new thoughts, ideas, speculations, theories, and discoveries to the searching and critical review of the whole scientific community. Every working scientist has had occasion to be grateful that the eagle eye of a colleague-somewhere has helped to put him back on the right track. It is also a well-known fact among scientists that learning comes not only from successes, but also from failures; it is as important to know what does not work as it is to know what does work. Thus the USSR is doing a great disservice to the world scientific community, and indeed to its own scientists, in eschewing the traditional openness of the scientist in the conduct of its space exploration.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION OF 1917

The Russo-Japanese War of 1905 and the revolt that followed showed that the Czarist regime was incompetent to conduct a war abroad, and extremely insecure at home. The Russian Empire in World War I performed better than most dispassionate outside observers would have expected in the light of the events of 1905. In 1914, the German General Staff planned to defeat France before the Russians mobilized, but the Russians succeeded in putting an army in the field earlier than expected, and this effort, while ended in defeat at Tannenberg, led to a diversion of German forces from the West and may have saved France. The Czar's army fought on for three more years, though the infantry did not have enough rifles to go around, and though all other arms and supplies -- such as cannon, shells, clothing, and food -- were often unavailable. Russian industry and railroads were unable to keep a large army supplied for a modern war, and though large quantities of supplies were sent by the Allies to Archangel, Murmansk, and Vladivostok, little of this reached the front.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the war in bringing on the Revolution. Peter Stolypin (Prime Minister, 1906-11) had seen that the land question was the most serious social weakness, and he had introduced agrarian reforms which divided land among the peasants, and which promised (to Lenin's dismay) to create a strong class of peasant proprietors. From 1907 to 1913, the average annual growth rate of industrial output was 6.25%; 1913, the average annual growth rate of industrial production was nearly five times that of 1885 (and exactly five times that of 1920). In 1914, the radical revolutionary leaders were all in exile in Siberia or abroad, so that when political and industrial unrest increased from 1912 to 1914, the ultimate result might have been the development of the Duma or representative assembly into a functioning parliament. But the war so aggravated all the weaknesses of the existing system that moderate solutions became impossible. There was personal corruption and rumor of treachery in the topmost circles, beginning with Rasputin and the Czarina. Russian technical and military leadership was completely at sea in the face of the demands of modern war. Much of industry was in the hands of absentee owners, and the concentration of large plants in a few centers made agitation among the workers easy. The war was a popular war, hatred of the Germans becoming almost a mania, but the sacrifices demanded were so extreme that a reaction was almost inevitable. And the German government was expending large sums and making great efforts to weaken the Russian regime by propaganda and subversion; some of the German money was received by the Bolsheviks.

After the murder of Rasputin on 29 December 1916, the Russian Empire was like a rudderless ship; the Czarina alternated between grief and vows of revenge, while the Czar isolated himself from outside contact, rejecting all suggestions for reform and a more representative government. Even conservative circles began plotting the deposition of Nicholas II. On 3 March 1917 (18 February Old Style), a major strike occurred in Moscow. Bread rationing had been introduced on 1 March, and a demonstration of men and women workers in Petrograd on 8 March became a bread riot. These riots continued during the following days, and by 11 March the demonstrators were calling "Down with the German woman," meaning the Czarina. Troops were ordered to fire on the crowd, but fired over the crowd's heads. Later that day some of the soldiers did fire into the mob, but most of the rank and file had no stomach for shooting at unarmed civilians and those who had fired repented their action. From 12 to 14 March one regiment after another of the 160,000 man Petrograd garrison refused to obey their officers and went over to what had now become a revolution. The defection of the troops was the key-factor, but almost all classes supported or at least accepted the deposition of Nicholas and the Czarina. Two main political forces emerged: the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet (Ex Com), with dominantly Menshevik control and a small Bolshevik minority, and the Emergency Committee of the established Duma, representing the more conservative parties. A Provisional Government was formed under Prince Lvov, largely from the center and right but with the participation of the Menshevik Kerensky, and both Ex Com and Emergency Committee agreed that the Provisional Government should eventually be replaced by a Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage, which would determine the future form of government.

(CONTINUED)

It is important to note that almost all elements agreed that the war against Germany should continue; the March revolution was much more a demand for more effective war leadership, and for an improvement of conditions at home and on the front, than an expression of defeatism. Mensheviks and Bolsheviks in Russia wanted a negotiated peace without annexations, but (with the exception of Molotov) even the Bolsheviks then in Russia favored a defensive continuation of the war until the revolution had been completed. All this changed when Lenin arranged with the German government for his return from Switzerland, crossing Germany in a sealed railroad car. The Bolsheviks organized a warm welcome for him at the Finland Station, but they were unhappy when he began haranguing against the war, and when he made a defeatist speech to a group of soldiers, the latter did not react favorably and one man commented: "We ought to stick our bayonets into a fellow like that."

Military discipline was weakening, however, as a result of the "February" (or March) Revolution, and in particular due to the Ex Com's Order No. 1, of 15 March, which provided for soldier's committees, and which stated that orders would only be obeyed if they did not conflict with the orders of the Soviet. Lenin and the other Bolsheviks, now following the leadership, spread defeatism and did their utmost to weaken the Provisional Government, demanding "All Power to the Soviets." Kerensky pushed an offensive in July, which succeeded at first, but which soon turned into a retreat. Some soldiers rose against the Provisional Government on 16 July, and the Bolsheviks came to their support, thinking their moment had come. But the rising collapsed, and the Provisional Government charged that Lenin was a German agent. The coincidence of the rising with a German counter-attack, and the flight of Lenin to Finland, while Trotsky and the other Bolsheviks remained behind to face arrest, convinced large sectors of Russian opinion of Lenin's guilt.

We may never know the full story of Lenin's relationship with the Germans. His own published papers and German Foreign Ministry documents show that he was in contact with German agents, and the latter materials strongly suggest that he received money from them. In 1915 a German agent reported an offer by Lenin to help Germany by attacking British India if the Bolsheviks came to power. Certainly German money went to the Bolsheviks up to November 1917, largely for propaganda purposes, and Bolshevik newspapers were reprinted and circulated on the front by the Germans. Bolshevik propaganda would have been crippled without German support, and of course the Germans played an indispensable role in bringing Lenin back from Switzerland. On the other hand, many of the documents on Lenin's guilt originating from Russia in 1917-18 have since been shown to be forgeries. The truth is no doubt simply that German aims and Lenin's aims largely coincided, and that each side sought to use the other for its own purposes. Lenin's ties with Germany have little interest today, except as an ironic comment on present-day Soviet attacks against imperialism, especially German imperialism; if it hadn't been for the real German imperialists like Ludendorff, Jagow, and Zimmermann, Lenin would never have come to power. But in the war-atmosphere of 1917, the charges of the Provisional Government were dynamite.

Kerensky, Prime Minister of the Provisional Government after 20 July, soon had to face a different threat, however. General Kornilov attempted to overthrow him, and Kornilov's attempt shattered only on the resistance of the Soviets and the troops loyal to them, combined with the lack of enthusiasm of Kornilov's own forces. The Bolsheviks joined in opposing Kornilov, and came forward to get their share of the arms issued by government arsenals, arms they refused to surrender after the emergency. Moreover, as in post-World War II propaganda about the resistance movements, the Bolsheviks claimed afterward that they had been the heart and soul of the opposition to Kornilov, and that the moderates like Kerensky had been at best lukewarm in opposing the would-be military dictator. Now the Bolsheviks, who were tireless agitators and propagandists, began to gain some support among the workers and soldiers. On 12 September the Petrograd Soviet passed a Bolshevik resolution for a republic, land for the peasant Soviets, the control of industry by

the workers, and immediate peace. By 8 October, the Bolsheviks had won control of the presidium of the Petrograd Soviet, and this gave them greater influence with the Petrograd garrison. The Bolsheviks aside, the Kornilov affair greatly hastened the demoralization of the army, and more and more deserters went home lest they miss out on a division of the land.

Lenin was, however, confronted with two problems: Kerensky was trying to send the unreliable and Bolshevik-penetrated Petrograd garrison to the front; and the Constituent Assembly was due to meet in December. Both these things were threats to his prospects. Shaved and wearing a wig as disguise, he returned from Finland and convinced the Bolshevik Central Committee that the time for a coup had come. Trotsky actually directed the preparations and issued the orders, while Lenin returned to hiding. Not surprisingly, the Petrograd troops had no enthusiasm for going to the front, and all but two regiments promised Trotsky they would refuse to leave. Kerensky searched in vain for a force he could rely on; in any case, his supporters refused to endorse the use of force. Trotsky won over the guards of the arsenal at the Fortress of St. Peter and St. Paul, and they passed out weapons to the Red Guards, which were made up of factory workers, and which were by now thoroughly controlled by the Bolsheviks. At Trotsky's direction, these Red Guards, armed party members, and the more active soldiers began on 6 November to seize one after another of the key points of the city: the railroad stations, power stations, bridges, the state bank, and the telephone exchange. On 7 November, Trotsky issued a proclamation stating that the Provisional Government had been overthrown, and on 8 November Red Guards arrested the ministers of the Provisional Government at the Winter Palace, except for Kerensky, who escaped.

There is a striking contrast between the coup of November and the Revolution of March. In March, large numbers of people and soldiers demonstrated day after day, scores of people were killed, and the whole movement, while influenced by socialists and others, had a spontaneous air. In November, small groups promptly seized key points, about 20 people were injured (none seriously), and the whole business was directed from the Bolshevik headquarters at the Smolny Institute. The November coup was not really conducted with great competence, but Kerensky's government was a completely spent force, even more than the Czar's had been. Major Goodspeed (see references) estimates that in Petrograd no more than 15,000 favored the November coup. The soldiers would not have defended Trotsky against a determined counter-attack, and in a short time the garrison was removed (or removed itself) from the capital; the new regime had to rely on soldiers and sailors from the Baltic states and Finland. On 25 November, elections were held for the Constituent Assembly; Lenin excepted, most of the Bolshevik leaders had expected a Bolshevik victory, but out of 41.7 million votes, only 9.8 million were Bolshevik, while 20.8 million were Social Revolutionary, i.e. votes for peasant ownership. Not only the peasants but many workers, such as the railway workers and post and telegraph workers, also the civil servants, were opposed to the Bolsheviks. Despite Bolshevik harassment and terror, the Constituent Assembly succeeded in meeting on 18 January 1918; huge crowds demonstrated in favor of the Assembly. But although the Assembly under Social Revolutionary leadership showed its genuinely revolutionary intent, passing resolutions for an armistice, land reform, a republic, and an international socialist congress, the Baltic guards broke the meeting up, and the Assembly was never able to reassemble. As Trotsky wrote later, "The simple, open, brutal breaking-up of the Constituent Assembly dealt formal democracy a finishing stroke, from which it has never recovered." (Trotsky, of course, did not sympathize with "formal" democracy.) Since the Bolsheviks could scarcely pretend to represent the will of the Russian people, it is not surprising that civil war followed, and that various generals attempted to overthrow the Bolsheviks (as the Bolsheviks had overthrown representative government) by force.

The reaction of bourgeois governments to the Bolshevik coup was influenced much more by their desires to win the war than by fear of Communism. When western forces (totalling only 25,000) were sent to Russian ports, their main mission was to prevent the transfer of Allied supplies at those ports to the Germans. Many English and American observers, in Russia and at home, hoped that the Bolsheviks could be turned against the Germans. One cannot grasp the situation unless one realizes that peace on the Russian front placed the western Allies in a desperate position; in the spring of 1918, the Germans, bringing forces from east to west, made advances on the western front which exceeded anything seen since August 1914, and Ludendorff came within an ace of winning the war. The belligerents all thought that civilization depended on the outcome. The Germans, of course, were overjoyed at the Bolshevik coup, and when on 26 November 1917 the Bolsheviks came to seek a truce, it appeared that all the efforts and subsidies of previous years had been worth while. The Bolsheviks were no doubt unhappy about the terms the Germans imposed at Brest-Litovsk, but their own policies, and especially the disintegration they had fostered in the Russian army, left them no alternative but to accept.

For all the unscrupulousness of their tactics, the Bolsheviks - were motivated by sincere desires to bring about a socialist revolution. The greatest tragedy of the Russian Revolution is that, instead of genuine socialism, the succeeding years, especially those under Stalin, saw the rise of a New Class, the elite of party and state bureaucracy. Instead of becoming a socialist society, spreading socialism elsewhere by force of example, the Soviet Union became an empire, spreading its doctrine in adjacent territory by military force and in more remote areas by subversive infiltration. For the New Class to secure its position, it had to be strong, at home and abroad. This meant a regime more absolutist than that of the Czar. The party and the tactics of Lenin, regarded as means to socialism, inevitably became ends in themselves.

References:

- Bertram D. Wolfe, THREE WHO MADE A REVOLUTION (1948)
- Major D. J. Goodspeed, "Petrograd 1917" in THE CONSPIRATORS (1961)
- Alan Moorehead, THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION (1958)
- George Kennan, RUSSIA LEAVES THE WAR (1956)
- " " THE DECISION TO INTERVENE (1958)
- " " RUSSIA AND THE WEST UNDER LENIN AND STALIN (1961), Chapter I
- W. H. Chamberlin, THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION (2nd ed., 1954)
- Leon Trotsky, HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION (1932-3)
- Sukhanov, N. N., THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION 1917 (1955)
- E. H. Carr, THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION 1917-1923, Vol. 1 (1950)
- David Schub, LENIN: A BIOGRAPHY (1948)